

ISSN 1343-8980

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成31年度／令和元年度
(第23号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2019
Volume XXIII

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2020・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2020

Some thoughts on Niḥsargikā Pātayantikā 27 (26) of the Sanskrit Sarvāstivāda *Bhikṣuprātimokṣasūtras*

Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ

In memoriam Seishi Karashima

Abstract:

The Central Asian manuscript fragments contain parts of two versions of a Sanskrit Sarvāstivāda *Bhikṣuprātimokṣasūtra*. In addition to deviations between both versions, each of them shows different degrees of influence from the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Bhikṣuprātimokṣasūtra*. In order to verify whether variants are solely different in wording or whether they also imply varying contents a thorough examination of each single rule is necessary. In the present contribution, I examine the variants in Niḥsargikā Pātayantikā 27, counted as 26 in some of the Sarvāstivāda sources and in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Bhikṣuprātimokṣasūtra*.

Keywords:

Central Asian Sarvāstivāda Sanskrit *Bhikṣuprātimokṣasūtras*, Niḥsārgika Pātayantikā 27 (26), *pravāraṇā*, *Kārttika*, *ātyayika cīvara*, *akālacīvara*, *upanikṣipen*, *dhārayen*, Mūlasarvāstivādin, Sarvāstivādin

A Sanskrit *Bhikṣuprātimokṣasūtra* (*BhPrMoSū*) of the Sarvāstivāda (Sarv) tradition established on the basis of 308 Central Asian manuscript fragments which, according to the editor's estimate, belong to about 211 manuscripts was published by Georg von Simson in 2000.¹ 174 of these manuscripts, that is, 82.5 percent, come from Kucha and surrounding areas (Kizil, Duldur Akur, Jigdalik), 9 percent from Shorchuk (19 mss.), 2.8 percent from the Turfan oasis (6 mss.), 0.5 percent from Dunhuang (1 ms.) and 5.2 percent from unknown find spots (11 mss.).² The version established by von Simson in his main text, called version B by him, is to the largest part documented in manuscripts from Kizil or probably from Kizil, which made von Simson assume that it probably originated in Kizil. This version represents a *BhPrMoSū* that probably was in use later than Kumārajīva's Chinese translation of the Sarvāstivāda *BhPrMoSū* (408 CE) which largely conforms to what von Simson calls version

¹ Most of the manuscripts have been published in transcription by von Simson in his first volume (von Simson 1986), additional ones in the second volume (von Simson 2000, 73–140). Since then several *Prātimokṣasūtra* fragments of the Sarvāstivādin have been identified and edited: *Turfan Collection*: 45 fragments in Wille 2014a; 194 (from *SHT* IX onwards) and 16 additional fragments in *SHT* XII, 487f. (from 6717 frg. 114 onwards); *London Collection*: 104 in Wille 2014b; 233 (without the fragments of Or.15009 in *BLSF* II and III which were already edited in von Simson 1986, 2000 for the first time) in *BLSF* II and III; for Or.15003 (additional fragments), Or.15007, Or.15008, and Or.15015, see Wille 2015a–d.

² For details, see von Simson 2000, 56–57, and n. 7.

A. The latter is mainly preserved in manuscripts from Duldur Akur.³ It is, however, possible that both versions originated before 408 CE, because Kumārajīva's translation also has readings of the B version in at least two cases.⁴ The oldest manuscript with version B is dated to the 5th c. CE on palaeographical grounds.⁵ The only manuscript dated according to the radiocarbon analysis (C14)—namely to the 7th c. CE—is manuscript AO which is not clearly assigned to any of the two versions.⁶ Whether the two versions are chronologically or regionally diverse remains unclear. However, it is obvious that both versions existed side by side.⁷ The fact that some of the divergences have consequences as to content⁸ renders it probable that they belonged to different subbranches of the Sarvāstivādins. In light of this possibility, it is necessary to clarify whether or not deviations are an expression of the affiliation to versions A and B or whether they result from other reasons.

Slightly different *Prātimokṣas* of one and the same *nikāya* seem to not have been the exception, but rather the rule. Clarke (2011, 2012, 2016–2017) has proved the existence of at least three deviating *Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣasūtras* within the Mūlasarvāstivāda (Mū) tradition. Emms (2012) showed that the four Mū *BhPrMoSū* fragments from Gilgit⁹ represent two deviating versions of a Mū *BhPrMoSū*. The Sanskrit Mū *BhPrMoSū* edited by Hu-von Hinüber (2003) based on a manuscript from the Northern Sa-skyā monastery in Tibet written in Proto-Bengali script¹⁰ (ca. 11th/12th c. CE) deviates here and there from the fragments in Gilgit,¹¹ and may represent again another subdivision. Karashima (2008, 71–90; 2013, 47–90), when publishing Sanskrit fragments of a Mahāsāṃghika (Mā) or Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravāda (Mā-Lo) *BhPrMoSū* allegedly from Bamiyan which slightly deviates from the *BhPrMoSūs* of both these schools, stated that “these differences are due to local differences or subdivisions among the schools”.¹² Nānatusita (2017, 196, 217), however, thinks this *BhPrMoSū* to have been compiled under adaptation of terms from a Mū and/or Sarv *BhPrMoSū* or a mixed recension of these two. The existence of further *BhPrMoSū* fragments which do not conform with any of the schools known to us,¹³ indicates that the diversity of *nikāyas* or *nikāya*

3. Von Simson 2000, 4.

4. Von Simson 2000, 7 (5.2.3), 10 (5.2.16; below, pp. 47–49); see also von Simson 2000, 2–3. Concerning versions A and B, von Simson (2000, 19–55; see also 3–4) lists which manuscript follows which version as far as this can be determined.

5. This is manuscript AA written in Script type III (Turkestan Gupta type), von Simson 2000, 3.

6. AO (*SHT* I 84). The C14 dating accords with the palaeographic dating, see Allon, and others 2006, 280.

7. Von Simson 2000, 3.

8. For instance NP 13 in version B has a different meaning because of the addition of the words *kalyāṇa-kāmatām upādāya* (I do not share von Simson's opinion that this only is an addition considered to be an explanation without legal consequences [von Simson 2000, 9: “Der ... Zusatz in Version B ist wohl nur als Erläuterung und nicht juristisch als Bedingung zu verstehen”]; see also Pāt 52 (von Simson 2000, 11) and Pāt 68 (von Simson 2000, 12 [5.2.26]; see also Ogihara 2013, 202, who refers to a Tocharian B fragment that goes with version A, and one that conforms to version B concerning two different passages of this rule).

9. For a facsimile edition, see Clarke 2014, 229–277.

10. Hu-von Hinüber 2006, 283–337, with information on this manuscript.

11. In her unpublished edition Hu-von Hinüber (2003) also noticed variants in the four Gilgit *BhPrMoSū* fragments (see above n. 9).

12. Karashima 2008, 72.

13. There is, for instance, a Kharoṣṭhi script manuscript in the Bajaur collection (Gandhara; 1st/2nd c. CE) with two different versions of a *BhPrMoSū* on its two sides, both covering nearly the same rules (NP 1–9 and 1–8). One version is closer to that of the Th and Mā-Lo, the other one to that of the Sarv and Mū (Strauch 2008, 26; Strauch 2014, §4). Two Sanskrit *BhPrMoSū* manuscripts (A and B) from the Southern Silk Road (Khādaliq) belong to unknown schools. Manuscript A shows a similarity in wording with the Sarv and Mū, but in the sequence of the Pāṭyantika rules it follows the Th tradition (Wille 2009, 50–64). In cases where the wording of

subbranches was larger than hitherto anticipated.¹⁴

A thorough comparison of the two Sarv *BhPrMoSū* versions based on the Central Asian manuscripts might yield further insights into the character of these two versions. Some of the deviations concern the sequence of the rules, others are mere variants in wording, yet others show differences as to content.¹⁵ Furthermore, we cannot exclude the possibility that one or another manuscript contained incorrect readings. Naturally such an investigation needs to take into account the Chinese translations of the Sarv *BhPrMoSū* and the *Vinayavibhaṅga* (*VinVibh*), as well as corresponding Tocharian versions.¹⁶ The Vinaya fragments in Tocharian belong to the Sarv, but there are fragments which reflect version A and others which reflect version B (Ogihara 2013, 202). There is also one case where the Tocharian fragment conforms to one of the Sarv *BhPrMoSū* manuscripts which has the same reading as the Mū tradition (Ogihara 2012, 170, 175). As Ogihara (2013, 203) states Tocharian B *VinVibh* fragments when they deviate from the Sarv text sometimes conform with the *VinVibh* of the Mū.¹⁷ This possibly is also valid for Tocharian A fragments.¹⁸ Thus the situation here is of a similar complexity as in the case of the Sanskrit fragments.

The sequence of Nihsargikā Pātayantikā 26 to 28

Concerning the rules Nihsargikā Pātayantikā (NP) 26 to 28, the Sarv tradition shows different sequences of the rules in various manuscript fragments. The sequence of von Simson's version B (26, 27, 28) does neither conform to the Sarv *VinVibh*, which has the rules in the reverse order (28, 27, 26), nor to the Chinese translation of the Sarv *BhPrMoSū* (28, 26, 27) which conforms to von Simson's version A and the sequence in the Mū *BhPrMoSū* (Sanskrit and Tibetan). Two of these Central Asian manuscripts belonging to version A originate from Kizil, two probably from Duldur Akur, and one, that represents a mixed recension (Sarv and Mū), from Sängim.¹⁹

the Sarv and Mū differs, however, this manuscript, to my mind, seems to more often follow the wording of the Mū. A Sanskrit *BhPrMoSū* fragment from the Lavrov collection of unknown origin (but possibly from the west of the Tarim Basin) dated to the 4th to 6th c. CE by the editors is tentatively ascribed to the Mā by them (Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya and Tyomkin 2000, 24, 29). Nānatusita (2018, 119) rejects this ascription and also excludes an affiliation to the Mā-Lo. According to him “there are indications that it might be connected to the Dharmaguptaka or Kāśyapīya schools.”

¹⁴ See also Wille 2009, 51: “We probably have to question the validity of our criteria for sectarian affiliation and their general applicability to this text. We do not know yet, to what extent the compilers of the monks' rules felt free to redact the text at this comparatively late state and in this region.”

¹⁵ For examples of these deviations, see von Simson 2000, 8–13; for differences concerning the contents, see above n. 8.

¹⁶ Pan 2017, 67–92, for an overview.

¹⁷ See also Pinault 1984, 391–392; Schaefer 1997, 169–170. Ogihara 2013, furthermore, refers to a forthcoming paper of his “On some Vinaya-texts in Tocharian B”, *Orientalia et Classica. Papers of the Institute of Oriental and Classical Studies of Russian State University for the Humanities XXIX*, which has not yet appeared.

¹⁸ See Hu-von Hinüber 1994, 61–64.

¹⁹ AK, Kizil, Rotkuppelraum, probably version A; AW, Kizil, Rotkuppelraum, version A; ED, Sängim, Pretatempel, mixed recension, mainly version A, but with readings from the B version and many readings of the Mū tradition; probably GB, probably from Duldur Akur, version A, but not fully consistent; probably RG, probably from Duldur Akur, version unclear.

| Sarv <i>BhPrMoSū</i> version B | In some Sarv mss. which mostly belong to version A | Sarv <i>VinVibh</i> | Sarv Chin. Transl. of the <i>BhPrMoSū</i> | Sarv Toch. | Mū Skt. and Tib. <i>BhPrMoSū</i> |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------|---|------------|--|
| NP 26 | NP 28 (AK, AW, ED; probably also in GB, RG) | NP 28 | NP 28 | | NP 28 |
| NP 27 | NP 26 (AK, ED, GY) | NP 27 | NP 26 | NP 26 | NP 26 |
| NP 28 | NP 27 (AK, GB, ED, prob. RG) | NP 26 | NP 27 | | NP 27 |

Nihsargikā-Pātayantikā 27 (26)

NP 27 (26) of the Sarv²⁰ is a rule shared with the nuns (*bhikṣuṇī*) in most of the Buddhist schools.²¹ Thus a study of the transmission of this nuns' rule in the *Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣasūtras* of the various schools and possibly existing comments on them might further elucidate how this rule was understood.

In addition to the difference in sequence, NP 27 (26) of von Simson's edition also shows a number of variants in wording. The rule is given as follows by von Simson in his main text, that is, in version B (2000, 201):²²

daśāhānāgatāyāṃ pravāraṇāyāṃ (BE, GA, GZ; similarly GY) *bhikṣor utpadyetākālacīvaram* (BL, CG) *ākāṃkṣatā tena bhikṣuṇā pratigṛhītavyaṃ pratigṛhya yāvac cīvarakālasamayā(n)* (BE °*mayāṃ*, BR °*mayād*, GZ °*mayā*) *nikṣiptavyaṃ tata uttaram* (AN, BE, ED) ***upanikṣipen*** (AN, BE, ED) *nihsargikā pātaya(n)tikā*.

Ten days prior **to the invitation ceremony** should an **out-of-season robe/robe material** accrue to a monk, that monk, may accept [it] if he wishes. Having accepted it, he may deposit [it] as long as the occasion of the season for [the donation of] robes [lasts]. If he should **deposit** it beyond that, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.²³

In contrast, the rule reads as follows if we insert the main variants put in bold in the footnotes by von Simson:

²⁰ Waldschmidt 1926, 55 (= 1979, 59) gives only number 26 for this rule in the Sanskrit and Chinese versions of the Sarv *BhPrMoSū*. In the Mū *BhPrMoSū* this rule corresponds to NP 26, in Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* to NP 28, in the Mī tradition to NP 18, in the Mā-Lo, Dha and Th traditions to NP 28.

²¹ Waldschmidt 1926, 55 (= 1979, 59) in addition to the numbers of the rules of the *BhPrMoSū* (above, n. 20) also gives the numbers of the corresponding rules in the *Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣasūtras* of the various schools: Sarv Chinese text NP 16; Mū Tibetan text NP 17, Chinese text none; Mī NP 14, Mā NP 28, Dha NP 17. In case of the Th tradition, Waldschmidt mentions no corresponding rule for nuns, but it is NP 29 (Pruitt & Norman 2008, 160–161). The absence of this rule in the Chinese version of the Mū is confirmed by Shayne Clarke (email 19.1.2020), and also is evident from Kabilsingh's (1991, 289–295) English translation of the Chinese version where this rule does not appear.

²² The manuscripts which have the reading of the rule are added by me within round brackets after the respective words with the sigla introduced by von Simson.

²³ This rule has been translated by von Simson (2000, 288) as “Angenommen, ein Mönch erhält (höchstens) zehn Tage vor der Pravāraṇā-Feier außerhalb der Zeit ein Gewand, dann darf er es, wenn er will, entgegennehmen und nach der Entgegennahme bis zum Zeitpunkt der Kleider(verteilung) deponieren. Wenn er es länger aufbewahrt, dann ist es ein Nihsargikā-Pātayantikā-Vergehen.” Von Simson translates *ākālacīvara* as if *ākāla* was used separately as an adverb. He, furthermore, understands *yāvac cīvarakālasamayāṃ* as an endpoint in time “up to the time when the robes are distributed” (“bis zum Zeitpunkt der Kleider(verteilung)”). For a translation from the Chinese, see Heirman 2002, II 506, n. 85.

daśāhānāgate kārṭṭike pūrṇamāse (BR, CG; prob. BA; ED °māsyā[ṃ]) *bhikṣor utpadye-tātyayi(kam cīva)raṃ* (BE; GY + zu GY;²⁴ GZ *dyeta a[t]y. .. kam cīva[ra]m*) *ākāṃkṣatā tena bhikṣuṇā* (AK add (cī)varam) *pratigrhītavyaṃ pratigrhya yāvac cīvarakālasamayā(n) nikṣiptavyaṃ* (GA; similarly GZ; BE, BU, CG °pitavyaṃ; BR [u](panikṣip°)) *tata uttaraṃ* (AK, GA; CG *uttari*) *dhārayen* (AK, BL, CG, DL, GA) *nihsargikā pātaya(n)tikā*.

Ten days prior to the full moon in [the month of] Kārṭtika, should a robe/robe material [given] in urgency accrue to a monk, that monk may accept [it] if he wishes. Having accepted it, he may deposit [it] as long as the occasion of the season for [the donation of] robes [lasts]. If he should wear/carry/keep²⁵ it for longer than that, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.

Variants in NP 27 (26)

1. *Daśāhānāgatāyāṃ pravāranāyāṃ* versus *daśāhānāgate kārṭṭike pūrṇamāse*

NP 27 (26) in some manuscripts starts with the words *daśāhānāgatāyāṃ pravāranāyāṃ* (BE, GA, GZ; GY *daśāham anāgatāyāṃ pra°*), “ten days prior to the invitation ceremony”. Manuscript BE originates from Kizil, Rotkuppelraum, and represents version B; GA probably from Duldur Akur follows version B; GZ and GY both probably from Duldur Akur cannot be assigned to any of the versions. This time specification is given in the main text by von Simson which in general represents his version B. But the same words are also met with in the Chinese translation of the Sarv *BhPrMoSū* which normally follows version A (Huber in Finot 1913, 501 [NP 26]: “dix jours avant la pravāraṇā”), and probably also in the Sarv *VinVibh* — also version A²⁶ — where Rosen translates “zehn Tage vor dem Ende der Regenzeit”.²⁷ Since the invitation ceremony concludes the rains retreat, Rosen’s translation would conform with this reading. Thus this time specification is to be met with in versions A and B.²⁸

A number of other manuscripts read *daśāhānāgate kārṭṭike pūrṇamāse*, “ten days prior to the full moon of the [month of] Kārṭtika.” This variant appears with versions A and B: Manuscript BR from Kizil, Rotkuppelraum (version unclear), manuscript CG probably from Kizil which mostly represents version A; probably manuscript BA (it has only a very short passage) from Kizil, Rotkuppelraum, which mostly represents version B; and manuscript ED from Sāngim which mostly follows version A, but has many readings corresponding to those of the Mū, as is also the case here (reads °māsyā[ṃ]).

The latter variant is very close to the reading of the Sanskrit Mū *BhPrMoSū* (NP 26 *daśāhānāgatāyāṃ kārṭṭikyāṃ paurṇamāsyāṃ*),²⁹ and somewhat less similar to the expressions used in the *BhPrMoSū* of the Theravāda (Th) tradition (*daśāhānāgataṃ kattikatemāsi-puṇṇamaṃ*)³⁰ and of the Mā-Lo school (NP 28 *daśāhānāgataṃ kho puna tremāsaṃ kārṭikī paunṇamāsī* [*paurṇamāsī*]).³¹ The Th tradition characterizes the full moon in the month of

²⁴ “Zu Gy” (Pelliot Sanskrit, petits fragments, 839) was edited by von Simson 2000, 91; but he forgot to mention this manuscript fragment in the footnote to the rule (201, n. 391). Together with GY 2 (von Simson 1986, 253) this fragment reads: *utpadyetātyayika[ṃ] (cīva)raṃ*. Information courtesy Klaus Wille.

²⁵ The root *dhṛ* has a large variety of meanings in connection with robes.

²⁶ Von Simson 2000, 3.

²⁷ Rosen 1959, 120.

²⁸ In his discussion of the differences between the A and B versions, von Simson (2000, 10) states that it is not clear which of the readings belongs to which version, since the Chinese translation of the Sarv *BhPrMoSū*, normally version A, here has the reading of version B.

²⁹ Hu-von Hinüber 2003, NP 26.

³⁰ Pruitt & Norman 2008, 42.

³¹ Pachow and Mishra 1952, NP 28; Tatia 1975, NP 28 [Mā-Lo].

Kārttika/Kattika as “Kattika fullmoon [at the end of a period of] three months” (Pāli *kattika-temāsi-puṇṇamā*). Since the earlier as well as the later rains retreat last three months, this expression could theoretically be considered to refer to both. But the expression *temāsi*, “lasting for three month”, does not refer to the duration of the rains retreat, but rather to the duration of the rainy season. *Kattika-temāsi-puṇṇamā* is “the full moon in the month of [the earlier] Kattika (*paṭhama-*, *pubba-Kattika*)³² [at the end of the] three months [of the rainy season]”. In contrast to that, the full moon at the end of the four months of the rainy season which concludes the later rains retreat is called *Kattika-cātumāsi-puṇṇamā*, “the full moon in the month of [the later] Kattika [at the end of the] four months [of the rainy season]” or “the later Kattika” (*pacchima-Kattika*),³³ or *komudī catumāsini*.³⁴ By the Mā-Lo, this is expressed slightly differently “ten days prior to the [end of the period of] three months, [that is, prior] to the Kārtikī full moon” (*daśāhānāgataṃ kho puna tremāsaṃ kārtikī pauṇṇamāsī [paurṇamāsī]*).³⁵ The mention of the three months renders it likely that the Mā-Lo, like the Th, refer to the first three months of the rainy season, and thus to the first *pravāraṇā*.

In the Sarv and Mū traditions the Kārttika is not specified and no reference as to the numbers of months passed by is contained. A restriction to the earlier *pravāraṇā* would presuppose that in the Sarv and Mū traditions, Kārttika is alternatively used as the name for two months too; to date I have not found any such reference. However, from the point of view of content, the *pravāraṇā* meant in NP 27 can only be the earlier *pravāraṇā*. The accrual of the robe/robe material which may be deposited throughout the robe season (beginning the day after the first *pravāraṇā*) predates the *pravāraṇā* by up to ten days. Ten days prior to the second *pravāraṇā* would be within the robe season, and therefore any donation would be regular (no need for a donation in urgency). Thus in the Sarv and Mū traditions too, Kārttika must have been used for the month of Āśvayuja. Concerning the Mū, in his translation of the rule Yijing gives “the earlier three months [of the] summer retreat”, and in the *VinVibh* he glosses “the earlier three months [of the] summer retreat” as “not the later retreat”.³⁶ According to Pachow, the Dharmaguptaka (NP 28)³⁷ and Kāśyapīya (NP 26) too relate this rule to the first *pravāraṇā*.³⁸

The fact that all other schools, as far as versions in Indian languages are available, refer to the full moon of the month of Kārttika, renders it likely that the variant referring to the Kārttika is the older one, and that at some time before 408 CE (date of Kumārajīva’s Chinese translation of the Sarv *BhPrMoSū*) it was replaced by the *pravāraṇā* variant. This replacement could be understood as an attempt to avoid the mention of the Kārttika month

³². DOP I s.v. Kattika.

³³. DOP III s.v. pacchima-kattika.

³⁴. DOP I s.v. komudī; II s.v. cātumāsini.

³⁵. Heirman 2002, II 506, n. 85, translates from the Chinese version of this rule for monks of the Mā (translated between 416 and 418 CE): “If, ten days before the end of the summer retreat, a *bhikṣu* obtains an emergency robe, he may personally accept it, if he needs it and he may keep it until the robe season.” Thus the Chinese version of the Mā seems to neither mention the *pravāraṇā* nor the Kārttika.

³⁶. Thanks to Shayne Clarke for this information (email, 10.1.2020).

³⁷. Heirman 2002, II 447, translates the corresponding rule for nuns from the Chinese as follows: “If, ten days before the end of the three summer months, a *bhikṣuṇī* [is offered] an emergency robe, and if the *bhikṣuṇī* knows that it is an emergency robe, she should accept it. After having accepted it, she should keep it until the robe season. If she keeps it longer, she [commits] a *nihsargika pācittika*.”

³⁸. Pachow 1955, 119: “ten days before the end of the third month of the summer”; “summer” here stands for the rainy season.

which actually stood for the Āśvayuja—a fact that seems to not have been as well known in the Indian Vinaya schools as in the Th tradition—, or the replacement took place because the earlier *pravāraṇā* was the regular or main *pravāraṇā*.³⁹ Whatever may have caused this change, the different wording of the two versions does not imply a difference as to content.

2. *Akālacīvara* versus *ātyayikacīvara*

The second significant difference of readings in NP 27 (26) concerns the robe which is given to a monk. In the main text (B version), von Simson reads *akālacīvara*, “out-of season robe/robe material”, that is, a robe or robe material given at a time other than the right time. This variant is preserved in two of his manuscripts. In the footnote, the reading *ātyayika cīvara*, “an urgent robe/robe material” or “robe/robe material [given] in urgency” is given as preserved in two other of his manuscripts, though it in fact is contained in three of them. The reading *akālacīvara* is contained in manuscript BL which comes from Kizil, Rotkuppelraum, and represents version B, and in manuscript CG which comes probably from Kizil and mostly represents version A. Thus there is no clear connection of the reading *akālacīvara* with any of the two versions.⁴⁰ A manuscript from the Hoernle collection of unknown findspot recently identified by Wille may also have read *akālacīvaraṃ*.⁴¹ Rosen in her edition of the Chinese translation of the Sarv *VinVibh* gives the reading *akālacīvaraṃ* in a footnote adding it to the Sanskrit text. Actually Rosen gives the reading of the Sanskrit text as printed by Finot (1913, 501). In cases of lacunae she complements the text based on the Chinese translation of the Sarv *VinVibh* (Rosen 1959, 12–13). In the present case Finot (1913, 501) only reads *cīvaraṃ*, indicating a lacuna before this word. The Chinese *VinVibh* clearly is based on a Sanskrit *ātyayika cīvara*. Thus it is completely unclear why Rosen adds *akāla* and not *ātyayika* to the Sanskrit text,⁴² especially since she translates *ātyayika cīvara*, “eine dringend dargebotene Gabe” (Rosen 1959, 120).

Among the manuscripts consulted by von Simson, *ātyayika cīvara* is testified in manuscripts BE from Kizil, Rotkuppelraum, representing version B,⁴³ GY + zu GY (accidentally omitted by von Simson),⁴⁴ and GZ,⁴⁵ both probably from Duldur Akur (version unclear). None of the other of von Simson’s manuscripts which contain parts of this rule has preserved enough of this portion to decide whether the manuscripts had *akāla*- or *ātyayikacīvara*.⁴⁶ But a *BhPrMoSū* fragment of the Hoernle collection from the Kucha surroundings⁴⁷ newly identified by Wille reads (*ātya*)*yikaṃ cī(varaṃ)*, and this also is the reading of a fragment of unknown findspot in the Turfan collection.⁴⁸ Furthermore, this also is the reading in the Chinese

^{39.} In the Th tradition this is made explicit by naming the first *pavāraṇā* the *mahāpavāraṇā*; see Norman and others 2018, 33 and n. 1.

^{40.} In discussing the differences between the versions, von Simson does not mention the variants *akālacīvara/ātyayikacīvara*.

^{41.} Wille 2015d, 513 (Or.15015/173 Ba /// .. *dyeta a[k]*. ///

^{42.} Rosen 1959, 120 n. 1.

^{43.} BE Bl. 60 v1 *dyetātyayi(kam cīva)raṃ*.

^{44.} von Simson 2000, 201, n. 391; see above, n. 24.

^{45.} GZ r1 /// .. *dyeta a[t]y. .. kam cīva[ra]m*.

^{46.} Manuscripts AK, AN, BA, BR, BU, DL, ED, GA. Unfortunately two further Sanskrit fragments (identified by Wille after the publication of von Simson’s edition) which cover this rule, one from Murtuq (*SHT* XI 4724 rz), and one of unknown findspot (*SHT* XII 7316) also do not contain this portion.

^{47.} Wille 2015b, 36 (Or.15007/82 v4 *yikaṃ cī(//)*).

^{48.} *SHT* XII 6451 Ra /// + [*a*]tyayikaṃ [*cī*]vara ///. Information courtesy Klaus Wille.

translations of the Sarv *VinVibh* (Rosen 1959, 120) and the *BhPrMoSū* (Huber in Finot 1913, 501 “done pressant”). The Tocharian fragment preserving parts of NP 27 unfortunately does not contain this portion.⁴⁹ A Sarvāstivāda *Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣasūtra* fragment covering the corresponding rule for nuns obviously also reads *ātyayikaṃ cīvaram*.⁵⁰ The *BhPrMoSūs* of other schools also have *cīvara ātyāyika/ātyayika* (Ma, Mā-Lo), *ātyayika cīvara* (Mū, Skt.),⁵¹ *acceka cīvara* (Th). None of them reads *akālacīvaram*. The same holds true for the Chinese translations of the *VinVibhs* of the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka.⁵²

From the point of view of content, there is a difference between the two terms. *Akālacīvara* is the counter term to *kālacīvara*. A *kālacīvara* is an “in-season robe/robe material”, that is, robe/robe material given at the “[right] time” (*kāla*). “[Right] time” in this connection is the robe season, that is, the season for robe donation in the last month of the rainy season. If, thereafter, a community opens the *kaṭhina* period which regularly lasts four months, the robe season becomes as long as the *kaṭhina* period lasts. In that case, the five months (1 month donation time and 4 months *kaṭhina* period) are “the [right] time” (*kāla*) or robe season. In addition, even robes given at the right time count as *akālacīvara* if they are given for specific monks, at least in the Pāli tradition (Vin III 204,3–5).

An *ātyayika cīvara* (Pāli *acceka cīvara*) is a robe given because of some urgent reason to specific monks or a specific rains residence up to ten days before the invitation ceremony on the fullmoon of Āśvayuja. It thus is an *akālacīvara* because of the time period in which it is given and, in addition, can be an *akālacīvara* when it is given to a specific monk.⁵³ Since, however, the time period for its donation is restricted to the ten days before the *pravāraṇā*, it is different from *akālacīvaras* given at any other time. It, furthermore, is different insofar as the premature donation is caused by some urgent reason of the donor like illness, a forthcoming journey, etc., which does not allow the donor to wait till the beginning of the robe season.⁵⁴ Unlike other *akālacīvaras*, the *ātyayikacīvara* may not be kept once the robe season is closed. Neither the ten days’ protection valid for surplus robes (*atireka cīvara*) according to the first NP is applicable, nor the time period of one month allowed according to the third NP for the depositing of an insufficient *akālacīvara* that accrued when the robes had been made up and the *kaṭhina* period is closed.⁵⁵ Thus, though the *ātyayikacīvara* is an *akālacīvara*, it has a further characteristic not shared by other *akālacīvaras*. Therefore, the term *akālacīvara* is wider than the term *ātyayikacīvara*, and not fitting in the context of this rule.⁵⁶

⁴⁹ I thank Hirotoshi Ogihara (email, 15.1.2020) for referring me to the online publication and translation of this fragment (<https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/?m-tht1460a>) which is listed by Pan 2017, 75.

⁵⁰ SHT X 3216 v2 /// [k].c(ī)va[r](a) .. + ///. Information courtesy Klaus Wille.

⁵¹ The Tibetan version speaks of a “set of robes” (Vidyabhusana 1915, 50 [NP 26]). Guṇaprabha’s *Vinaya-sūtra*, where this rule is counted as NP 28, designates it as *ātyayikanaiḥsargikah* (Vin 2.901). See the preliminary transliteration of the ms. found in Tibet by Rahula Sankrityayana by Yoshiyasu Yonezawa and others (Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University), available on GRETEL (http://gretel.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretel/1_sanskrit/4_rellit/buddh/vinsutru.htm). Mvy 8412 (NP 26) mentions *kārttikātyayikam*.

⁵² Thanks for this information to Shayne Clarke. Pachow, unfortunately, does not mention the robe for most of the schools, and thus is of little help here.

⁵³ The notion that an *acceka cīvara* turns into a *kālacīvara* once the robe season has begun (so Heirman 2002, II 506, n. 86; Matsumura 1996, 214, n. 284) is incorrect.

⁵⁴ See also Matsumura 1996, 213f., n. 284.

⁵⁵ For a long discussion of these circumstances in the Pāli commentarial literature, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013, II Z 177.

⁵⁶ Nolot’s (1991, 188, n. 76) statement that *ātyāyikacīvara* is a synonym of *akālacīvara* is incorrect.

Now, if NP 27 (26) in version B says “[If] ten days prior to the invitation ceremony out-of-season robe/robe material accrues”, this restricts the time frame for the donation of this *akālacīvara* to a period of ten days before the *pravāraṇā*, without giving any reason why this *akālacīvara* should be treated differently from other *akālacīvaras* offered, let’s say, eleven days before the *pravāraṇā*. Contrary to that, the reading *ātyayika cīvara* gives a specific characteristic, namely “given in urgency”, and thus differentiates it from any other *akālacīvara*. In light of this we have to question whether the reading *akālacīvara* in this rule is an alternative reading at all, and not rather a wrong reading. Given the fact that version B of the Sarv *BhPrMoSū* is the only version which has the reading *akālacīvara*, testified by only three manuscripts out of altogether fifteen covering portions of this rule, and considering that all other versions of Sarv texts and all other schools have a form of *ātyayika cīvara*, it is highly probable that *akālacīvara* here is a wrong reading.⁵⁷ If that assumption proves right—and the content of this rules renders this highly probable—the reading *akālacīvara* needed to be replaced by *ātyayika cīvara* in von Simson’s version B.

Two of the manuscripts which transmit *akālacīvara* (BL and CG) either come from Kizil or probably from Kizil, and also share some other readings. Both have the reading *dhārayen* instead of *upanikṣipen* in conformity with the Mū (see below, 3.). CG further reads *uttari* typical for the Mū instead of *uttaram* (not preserved in BL) which is typical for the Sarv. BL and CG (together with BR) also share the same beginning of NP 28 (*bhikṣavaś cet sambahulā*) which again conforms with that of the Mū. A thorough comparison of these two manuscripts might possibly yield further insights concerning their relation. The third manuscript is quite small, and does not allow to see its relation to the other manuscripts.

3. *Upanikṣipen* versus *dhārayen*

The third deviation is the usage of *dhārayen* instead of *upanikṣipen*. In the main text NP 27 (26) has *nikṣiptavyaṃ* (GA, GZ) — with variants *nikṣipitavyaṃ* (BE, BU, CG) and *[u](panikṣip°?)* (BR)— ... *upanikṣipen* (AN, BE, ED). In the footnote, *dhārayen* is given as a variant for *upanikṣipen* in manuscript AK from Kizil, Rotkuppelraum, which possibly follows version A, manuscript BL from Kizil, Rotkuppelraum, which represents version B, manuscript CG probably from Kizil, and mostly representing version A, as well as manuscript GA probably from Duldur Akur, representing version B. Thus again there is no clear connection of this variant to versions A or B. Based on the regular structure of such sentences one would expect identical or similar verbs used for the future passive participle and the finite verb. This is not given in *nikṣiptavyaṃ/ nikṣipitavyaṃ ... dhārayed*. If we compare the other schools’ *BhPrMoSūs* they have *nikṣipitavyaṃ ... nikṣipeya* (NP 28) in case of the Mā-Lo school, *nikkhipitabbam ... nikkhipeyya* in the Th tradition (NP 28), and *dhārayitavyaṃ ... dhārayen* in the Mū tradition (NP 26). Thus the Sarv reading *nikṣipitavyaṃ* could be an influence from the Mā-Lo (*nikṣipitavyaṃ*) or Th (*nikkhipitabbam*), while *dhārayen* obviously is an influence of the Mū tradition, but without having adjusted the preceding *nikṣiptavyaṃ* to this new finite verb. The Mū tradition seems to be the only one which forms both verbs from the root *dhṛ*. Thus this is a case of Mū influence on versions A and B, which leads to an inconsistent word

⁵⁷ The author of the *Vinayasamgraha* states that some commentators view the *ātyayika cīvara* as *akālacīvara*. This suggests that the author of the *Vinayasamgraha* does not share this view (information courtesy Shayne Clarke). But, as stated above, it is not in doubt that an *ātyayika cīvara* is an *akālacīvara*. However, this does not mean that we can replace *ātyayika cīvara* by *akālacīvara*, since not every *akālacīvara* is an *ātyayika cīvara*.

combination *nikṣiptavyaṃ* and *dhārayen* in the Sarv *BhPrMoSū* and thus, certainly, is not the original reading. Since many of the manuscripts which have the reading *dhārayen* do not preserve the *nikṣiptavyaṃ* passage, it remains unclear whether one of them perhaps also replaced the *nikṣiptavyaṃ* by *dhārayitavyaṃ*. However that may be, this difference is later and due to Mū influence, and does not imply a substantial difference as to content.

Conclusions

When establishing the Sarv *BhPrMoSū*, von Simson was well aware that he created a version which in this form never existed in a single manuscript.⁵⁸ The main reason for this is that many of the short fragments cannot be assigned to any of the two versions, that some variants come up with both versions, and that there are no manuscripts containing the complete text. From the three deviating readings in NP 27 (26) none can be safely connected with any of the two versions, because the variants appear in texts and manuscripts belonging to both. The first case (replacement of the Kārttika variant by the *pravāraṇā* variant) probably was an attempt to make the rule easier to understand, but does not imply a difference as to content. Since Kumārajīva also has the *pravāraṇa* variant in his Chinese translation of the *BhPrMoSū*, this replacement must have taken place some time before 408 CE in the *BhPrMoSūs* of at least some of the Sarvāstivādins. The second variant (*akālacīvara* for *ātyayika cīvara*) implies a difference as to content, but since it is pointless, the variant, even though documented in three manuscripts, most probably is a wrong reading. Hence *ātyayika cīvara* should be the reading in versions A and B. The third variant (replacement of *upanikṣipen* by *dhārayen*) is a clear case of Mū influence without creating a real difference as to content. The replacement led to a disharmonic wording of the rule in those manuscripts which did not replace the earlier verb in conformity with the new finite verb. Whether there are Sarv manuscripts where the earlier verb was replaced too, is unknown. No manuscript with such a reading has yet been found.

This brief examination makes plain that a thorough investigation of all the rules is needed in order to be able (1) to verify in how far the two Sarv Sanskrit versions of the *BhPrMoSū* mutually deviate, (2) to analyse what these deviations imply and (3) to determine whether or not these deviations are so profound as to presuppose the existence of two different subbranches of this tradition.

Acknowledgement

My thanks go to Shayne Clarke for his comments and for correcting and improving my English. I, furthermore, want to thank Klaus Wille for informing me about his new identifications and editions of manuscript fragments, for his additions and comments, and for providing me with literature. Last but not least, I thank Noriyuki Kudo for accepting this article for *ARIRIAB* and for the diligent, smooth and quick editing process. Sadly, Seishi Karashima, who invited me to contribute to this volume two weeks before his premature death, is no longer with us. I dedicate this small article to him as a humble token of my respect and admiration.

^{58.} Von Simson 2000, 2–15, especially 15.

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| <i>BhPrMoSū</i> | <i>Bhikṣuprātimokṣasūtra</i> |
| <i>BBDD</i> | <i>From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research. Papers Presented at the Conference 'Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: The State of the Field', Stanford, June 15–19 2009</i> , ed. Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Denkschriften, 460. Bd. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, 80. Wien: ÖAW, 2014. |
| <i>BLSF</i> | <i>The British Library Sanskrit Fragments</i> , ed. Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille, vol. II and III, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology Soka University, 2009 and 2015. |
| Chin. | Chinese |
| Dha | Dharmaguptaka |
| <i>DOP</i> | Margaret Cone, <i>Dictionary of Pāli</i> , Vol. 1, Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2001; Vol. 2, Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2010; Vol. 3, Bristol: Pali Text Society (forthcoming). |
| GRETEL | Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages (http://gretel.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretel.html) |
| Mā | Mahāsāmghika |
| Mvy | <i>Mahāvvyutpatti</i> , ed. R. Sakaki, 2 vols., Kyoto 1926. |
| Mā-Lo | Mahāsāmghika-Lokottaravāda |
| Mī | Mahīśāsaka |
| ms(s). | manuscript(s) |
| Mū | Mūlasarvāstivādin |
| NP | Niḥsārgikā-Pātayantikā, Naiḥsārgikā-Pātayantikā, Nissaggiya Pācittiya |
| Pāt | Pātayantikā |
| Sarv | Sarvāstivādin |
| <i>SHT</i> | <i>Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfan-Funden</i> , ed. Ernst Waldschmidt and others, vol. Iff. Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, X. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1965ff. |
| Skt. | Sanskrit |
| Th | Theravāda |
| Tib. | Tibetisch |
| Toch. | Tocharisch |
| <i>VinVibh</i> | <i>Vinayavibhaṅga</i> |

List of References

- Allon, Mark, Richard Salomon, Geraldine Jacobsen, Ugo Zoppi. 2006. “Radiocarbon Dating of Kharoṣṭhī Fragments from the Schøyen and Senior Manuscript Collections,” in *Buddhist Manuscripts III*, ed. J. Braarvig. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 4. Oslo, 279–291.
- Clarke, Shayne. 2011. “Guṇaprabha, Yijing, Bus Ton and the Lack of a Coherent System of Rules for Nuns in the Tibetan Tradition of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya,” conference “Buddhist Nuns in India”, Trinity College, University of Toronto, April 16. [unpublished].
- . 2012. “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms: On the Affiliation of the Tibetan Nuns’ Lineages and Beyond,” Oslo Buddhist Studies Forum, June 12. [unpublished].
- . 2014. *Vinaya Texts*. Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India. Facsimile Edition, Vol. 1. New Delhi: The National Archives of India, and Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- . 2016–2017. “Lost in Tibet, found in Bhutan: The Unique Nature of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Law Code for Nuns,” *Buddhism, Law and Society* 2. 197–292.
- Emms, Christopher. 2012. “Evidence for two Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya Traditions in the Gilgit Prātimokṣa-Sūtras,” MA Thesis McMaster University.
- Finot, Louis. 1913. “Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādins. Texte Sanskrit par Louis Finot avec la version chinoise de Kumārajīva traduite en français par Édouard Huber,” *Journal Asiatique* Novembre-Décembre, 465–557.
- Heirman, Ann. 2002. *The Discipline in Four Parts’. Rules for Nuns according to the Dharmaguptakavinaya*. 3 parts. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

- Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan. 1994. *Das Poṣadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*. Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, Monographie 13. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag.
- . 2003. *Das Bhikṣu-Prātimokṣasūtra der Mūlasarvāstivādins* anhand der Sanskrit-Handschriften aus Tibet und Gilgit sowie unter Berücksichtigung der tibetischen und chinesischen Übersetzungen kritisch herausgegeben, unpublished manuscript, accessible online <https://freidok.uni-freiburg.de/data/9535>.
- . 2006. "Remarks on the Manuscript of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Prātimokṣasūtra," in *Jaina-itiḥāsa-ratna. Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*, ed. Ute Hüsken, Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Anne Peters. Indica et Tibetica, 47. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 283–357.
- Kabilsingh, Chatsumarn. 1991. *The Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*, translated into English. Bangkok: Thammasat University.
- Karashima, Seishi. 2008. "Fragments of a Manuscript of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottara)vādins (1)," *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2007*, vol. 11, 71–90.
- . 2013. "Manuscript Fragments of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottaravādin)s (2)," *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2012*, vol. 16, 47–90.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. 2013. *Verlorene Gaṇṭhipadas*. 3 Vols. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission, 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Matsumura, Hisashi. 1996. "The Kaṭhinavastu in the Vinayavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādins," in *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuenetdeckungen und Neueditionen III*, ed. Gregory Bongard-Levin and others. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Beiheft 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 145–239.
- Ñāṇatusita, Bhikkhu. 2017. "The Bāmiyān *Prātimokṣasūtra*: a 'Buddhist Hybrid Text'," *Journal of Buddhist Studies* XIV, 183–226.
- . 2018. "The Lavrov Collection *Prātimokṣasūtra*," *Journal of Buddhist Studies* XV, 111–126.
- Nolot, Édith. 1991. *Le Bhikṣuṇīvinaya de l'école Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin. Traduction annotée, commentaire, collation du manuscrit*. Paris: Édition Diffusion de Boccard.
- Norman, K. R., Petra Kieffer-Pülz, William Pruitt. 2018. *Overcoming Doubts (Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī)*, Vol. I: *The Bhikkhu Pātimokkha Commentary*, Bristol: Pali Text Society.
- Ogihara, Hirotoshi. 2012. "A fragment of the *Bhikṣu-prātimokṣasūtra* in Tocharian B," *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 13, 163–180.
- . 2013. "Tocharian Vinaya texts in the Paris collection," *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 14, 187–211.
- Pachow, W. 1955. *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa: On the Basis of its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pali Versions*. Santiniketan: Sino-Indian Cultural Society.
- Pachow, W. and R. Mishra. 1956. *The Prātimokṣa-sūtra of the Mahāsāṃghikas*. Allahabad: Gaṅgānāth Jhā Research Institute.
- Pan, Tao. 2017. "A Glimpse into the Tocharian Vinaya texts," in *Rules of Engagement. Medieval Traditions of Buddhist Monastic Regulation*, ed. Susan Andrews, Jinhua Chen, Cuilan Liu, Bochum: projekt verlag, 67–92.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1984. "Un fragment du *Vinayavibhaṅga* en Koutchéen," *Journal Asiatique* 272.3–4, 369–393.
- Pruitt, William (transl.) and K. R. Norman (ed.). 2008. *The Pātimokkha*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Rosen, Valentina. 1959. *Der Vinayavibhaṅga zum Bhikṣuprātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins. Sanskritfragmente nebst einer Analyse der chinesischen Übersetzung*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden, 2. Institut für Orientalforschung, 27. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Schaefer, Christiane. 1997. "*wasik₁ kalpaṣṣuki*. Zu den westtocharischen Nominalbildungen auf -uki₁," *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 7, 163–176.
- Simson, Georg von. 1986, 2000. *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*. Vols. 1 and 2. Nach Vorarbeiten von Else Lüders und Herbert Härtel herausgegeben. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden XI. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Kl., Dritte Folge, Nr. 155, 238. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Strauch, Ingo. 2008. *The Bajaur collection: A new collection of Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts. A preliminary catalogue and survey*. Online version 1.1. (May 2008).

- . 2014. “Looking into water-pots and over a Buddhist scribe’s shoulder — On the deposition and the use of manuscripts in early Buddhism,” *Études Asiatiques* 68/3, 797–830.
- Tatia, Nathmal. 1975 (2032). *Prātimokṣasūtram. Lokottaramahāsāṃghikānāṃ prātimokṣasūtram*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, 16. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, M. I., and E. N. Tyomkin. 2000. “A Fragment of the Prātimokṣa-sūtra from the P. I. Lavrov Collection at the St.Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies,” *Manuscripta Orientalia. International Journal for Oriental Manuscript Research* 6.4 (2000), 24–29.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1926 [1979]. *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins. Mit einer Darstellung der Überlieferung des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa in den verschiedenen Schulen*. Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte Heft III. Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft [Reprint: Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, 2. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag].
- Wille, Klaus. 2009. “Buddhist Sanskrit Sources from Khotan,” in *BLSF* II, 25–72.
- . 2014a. “Survey of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Turfan Collection (Berlin),” in *BBDD*, 187–211.
- . 2014b. “Survey of the Identified Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Hoernle, Stein, and Skrine Collections of the British Library (London),” in *BBDD*, 223–246.
- . 2015a. “The Additional Sanskrit Fragments of Or.15003 in the Hoernle Collection,” in *BLSF* III, 1–12.
- . 2015b. “The Sanskrit Fragments Or.15007 in the Hoernle Collection,” in *BLSF* III, 13–198.
- . 2015c. “The Sanskrit Fragments Or.15008 in the Hoernle Collection,” in *BLSF* III, 199–230.
- . 2015d. “The Sanskrit Fragments Or.15015 in the Hoernle Collection,” in *BLSF* III, 485–551.